

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending. By this response, claims 1, 5, 10 and 11 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance based on the above amendments and following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-1 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Haraguchi et al. (US 6,222,613). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1, 5, 10 and 11, as amended, recite, *inter alia*, the obtaining processed image data by carrying out image processing on image data obtained by a digital camera according to default processing conditions, which are processing conditions common for all models of digital camera, regardless of a model of each digital camera, and processing conditions corresponding to a model of the digital camera,

In embodiments of the present invention, two separate processing conditions, (1) the default processing condition and (2) the processing condition corresponding to a model of a digital camera, are stored and used for processing images. The default processing conditions are image processing conditions that are common to all models of a digital camera. The second processing conditions are specific to their particular model of digital camera. Each of the two different processing conditions are customizable.

In contrast, Haraguchi teaches an image processing apparatus that only stores image processing conditions for under particular camera types. This is evidenced in Haraguchi in which it states at column 10, lines 62-66 that “the image processing conditions memory 73 for storing image processing conditions, which are predetermined of each type of digital camera.” Haraguchi defines what the image processing additions are and where they are stored at column 11, lines 13-16 in which it discloses “the image processing conditions stored in the conditions memory 73 includes, e.g., the amount of color/density level shift, the amount of contrast conversion, etc.” Haraguchi then teaches that the image processing conditions stored in memory 73 are stored for each model of digital camera. See column 11, lines 30-31. Thus, reference to the image processing conditions within Haraguchi refers to image processing conditions associated with a particular digital camera selected amongst the various digital camera types.

The Examiner confirms this understanding of Haraguchi. The Examiner states at pages 2 and 3 of the Office Action, "Haraguchi et al. teaches that a list of processing conditions exists for several types of digital cameras. Haraguchi et al. teaches on Column 11, Lines 24-26 that an image can be read by the image processing apparatus having data attached to the image that specifies the type of digital camera used to capture the image. Once the type of digital camera is determined, the image processing system finds the corresponding set of processing conditions in memory and sets the processing conditions accordingly." Therefore, Haraguchi does not teach the default processing conditions as claimed. Haraguchi teaches a system in which processing conditions are stored in relation to a specific digital camera. This is in contrary to the claimed features of the independent claims 1, 5, 10 and 11 in which the default processing conditions are common to all digital cameras regardless of the model of each of the digital cameras.

Therefore, Haraguchi fails to teach the above claimed features recited in independent claims 1, 5, 10 and 11. Thus, Haraguchi fails to teach each and every feature of the independent claims as required. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-4 and 6-9 are also distinguishable in view of Haraguchi teachings for the above reasons as well as for the additional features they recite. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-11 are distinguishable over the cited art. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad J. Billings Reg. No. 48,917 at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Application No. 09/842,922
Amendment dated September 14, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 16, 2006

Docket No.: 2091-0241P

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37.C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.14; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: September 14, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Michael R. Cammarata

Registration No.: 39,491

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant